



Docket No.: 243466US2

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/674,529
Applicants: Mamoru SAKAMOTO
Filing Date: October 1, 2003
For: INTERRUPT CONTROLLING METHOD CAPABLE
OF EXECUTING INTERRUPT PROCESS WHILE
AVOIDING SLOWING-DOWN OF EXECUTION
SPEED OF TASK PROCESS
Group Art Unit: 2111
Examiner: KIM, KENNETH S.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

Response to Restriction Requirement

Our credit card payment form in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)

(703) 413-2220 (fax)

I:\ATTY\W\TB\2524\243466US\SH T PTO 27FEB06.DOC

W. Todd Baker

Registration No. 45,265

DOCKET NO: 243466US2



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
MAMORU SAKAMOTO : EXAMINER: KIM, KENNETH S.
SERIAL NO: 10/674,529 :
FILED: OCTOBER 1, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2111
FOR: INTERRUPT CONTROLLING :
METHOD CAPABLE OF EXECUTING
INTERRUPT PROCESS WHILE
AVOIDING SLOWING-DOWN OF
EXECUTION SPEED OF TASK PROCESS

REPOSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction requirement of February 1, 2006, applicants elect, with traverse, the invention of Group I (Claims 1-19).

Applicants traverse the outstanding election requirement on the grounds that it has not been established that it be an undue burden to examine each of the noted inventions and claims together.

Under M.P.E.P. § 803, a election is not proper if a search and examination can be made without a serious burden on the Examiner, and the outstanding election requirement has not established that examining each of the currently-pending claims together would result in an undue burden.

M.P.E.P. § 803 specifically states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on

Application No. 10/674,529


Reply to Restriction Requirement dated February 1, 2006

the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

The outstanding election requirement has not established that each of the claims could be examined without an undue burden, and thus each of the noted inventions and claims should be examined on their merits.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 06/04)

W. Todd Baker
Registration No. 45,265

I:\ATTY\WTB\2524\243466US\RESTRICT RESPONSE 23FEB06.DOC